

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 17 has been amended. Claims 18-31 remain unchanged. New claims 32-34 have been introduced.

Applicant has amended claim 17 to make clear the distinction over Dietle et al (US 5,765,637) in that drawdown across the drilled hole enables "*cleaning the hole of debris*". Not only is a drawdown not taught in Dietle, but more importantly the application of the drawdown in cleaning debris is not suggested. The advantage of this is to allow good fluid communications between the chamber and the formation (see fifth paragraph of page 2 of application as filed).

Moreover, applicant disagrees with the examiner as to the relevance of Dietle in that claim 17 appears to have several features that are not disclosed in Dietle.

Claim 17 of the present application is distinguished in reciting "*positioning a drilling tool...*". A drilling tool is different from a fired projectile (14), but to avoid any doubt, applicant draws the examiner's attention to the final paragraph of page 2 of the present application as filed which describes the disadvantages of explosive charge systems. Dietle is such a system in firing a projectile (14) using a powder chamber (30) with propellant, which is precisely what the "drilling tool" of the present application seeks to overcome. More specifically, the present application describes how such explosive charge systems might be damaging to a sensor (sentence spanning pages 2 and 3).

Claim 17 also recites "*a method of installing a sensor in a well...located in a carrier on the outside of the casing*". Dietle is not concerned with installing a sensor or of installing a sensor in a carrier located on an outside of the casing, rather Dietle teaches at column 4 lines 43 to 47 that sampling is performed by devices located within the now empty propellant chamber 30

(see also figure 4 of Dietle). This propellant chamber is located within the casing wall of the well itself and is not located in a carrier on the outside of the casing as claimed.

Claim 17 also recites “*drilling through the casing, carrier and cement*”, but Dietle makes no disclosure of drilling through the ‘carrier’. Dietle has a different physical configuration wherein Figure 4 shows that the projectile 14 will pass through the casing and cement, but not through the ‘sampling’ chamber. There is no disclosure of ‘drilling’ in general, but there is certainly no disclosure of drilling through an additional ‘carrier’ element as claimed.

Examiner considers claims 22, 28 and 29 to contain allowable subject matter. Consequently, new claim 32 has been written into independent form containing the features of claims 1 and 28, new claim 33 contains the features of claims 1 and 29, and new claim 34 contains the relevant features of claims 1, 20 and 22.

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed September 24, 2007 for which the three-month date for response is December 24, 2007. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-2183 (Reference Number 21.1059).

Dated: December 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James L. Kurka/
James L. Kurka
Registration No.: 47,726
Schlumberger Technology Corp.
200 Gillingham Lane
Sugar Land, TX 77478
281-285-6493 (tel)
281-285-8821 (fax)